



Mayor's Office of Contract Services
Contract Performance Evaluation
CONSTRUCTION

Vendor Name:	JB CUSTOM MASONRY & CONCRETE INC		
Vendor TINEIN:	141852390		
Vendor Address:	104 - 11 101ST STREET OZONE PARK, NY 11417 US		
Vendor E-Mail Address:	joe@JBGeneralContracting.com		
Vendor Updated Mailing Address:	address is correct OPR CONTRACT: BG-1009M		
Contract Number:	CTI 846 20090035411		
Procurement Identification Number:	8462009B000C01		
Contract Term:	05/05/2009 - 05/04/2010		
Contract Description:	RECONSTR OF SDWLKS DAMAGED BY ADJ CITY-OWNED TREES		
Award Amount:	\$937,500.00		
Evaluating Agency:	DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION		
Evaluation Period:	05/05/2009 - 07/09/2010		
Evaluator First Name:	Matthew	Evaluator Last Name:	Wells
Evaluator Phone Number:	718-760-6725		
Evaluator E-Mail Address:	Gina.Brugman@parks.nyc.gov		
1. TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE (Evaluators are to consider the following criteria when rating timeliness; discuss specifics in the Comments section.) 1. Was the contract work completed on time, and if ongoing, is the vendor appropriately adhering to schedules and milestones; 2. If the vendor was given any extensions of time, were any such extensions reasonable; and 3. Were any unreasonable delays in the work caused by the vendor or any of its subcontractor(s)?			
Comments: All work was completed on time. The final inspection was started prior to the SCD but was completed several days after.			

There were no unreasonable delays in work caused by the contractor.

THIS IS A FINAL EVALUATION.

Subcategory Rating

Unsatisfactory

Poor

Fair

Good

Excellent

II. FISCAL ADMINISTRATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY (Evaluators are to consider the following criteria when rating Fiscal Administration and Accountability; discuss specifics in the Comments section.)

1. Did the vendor meet its budgetary goals, exercising reasonable efforts to contain costs, including change order pricing;
2. Has the vendor met any/all of the minority, women and emerging business enterprise participation goals and/or Local Business enterprise requirements, to the extent applicable;
3. Did the vendor and any/all subcontractors comply with applicable Prevailing Wage requirements;
4. Did the vendor maintain adequate records and logs, and did it submit accurate, complete and timely payment requisitions, fiscal reports and invoices, change order proposals, timesheets and other required daily and periodic record submissions (as applicable);
5. Did the vendor submit its proposed subcontractors for approval in advance of all work by such subcontractors; and
6. Did the vendor pay its suppliers and subcontractors, if any, promptly?

Comments:

The contractor did not use subcontractors. There are no MWBE requirements for this project. The contractor submitted timely and accurate payments. The contract was completed within the budget.

Subcategory Rating

Unsatisfactory

Poor

Fair

Good

Excellent

III. PERFORMANCE AND OVERALL QUALITY OF WORK (Evaluators are to consider the following criteria when rating Performance Quality; discuss specifics in the Comments section.)

1. Did the vendor and its subcontractors perform the contract with the requisite technical skill and expertise;
2. Did the vendor adequately supervise the contract and its personnel, and did its supervisors demonstrate the requisite technical skill and expertise to advance the work;
3. Did the vendor adequately staff the contract;
4. Did the vendor fully comply with all applicable safety standards and maintain the site in an appropriate and safe condition;
5. Did the vendor fully cooperate with the agency, e.g., by participating in necessary meetings, responding to agency orders and assisting the agency in addressing complaints from the community during the construction as applicable; and
6. Did the vendor adequately identify and promptly notify the agency of any issues or conditions that could impact the quality of work or result in delays, and did it adequately and promptly assist the agency in resolving problems?

Comments:

J&B performed the work to a good standard and staffed the contract appropriately.

J&B was responsive to agency requests, particularly at handling work added to the contract following a storm emergency. While most complaints from the community were resolved ably and promptly by J&B, occasionally they were not resolved or even forwarded to the supervising resident engineer or agency contact. Following a field instruction, J&B did a better job of passing community complaints through the appropriate channels and ultimately J&B replaced the supervisor.

Subcategory Rating

Unsatisfactory

Poor

Fair

Good

Excellent

Overall Rating (Based on the above three subcategory ratings, evaluators are to give the vendor an overall rating.)

Overall Rating

Unsatisfactory

Poor

Fair

Good

Excellent

The foregoing evaluation represents my best judgment concerning the performance of the contractor and is based on documentation on file at the City Agency.

Evaluated By: Matthew Wells

Evaluation Date: 02/02/2011

For Evaluator Use Only

Upon completing the PE, use the Check Errors button to validate the document. After checking errors, you must forward your completed evaluation to ACCO/DACCO/Designated Contact. To do so, save the completed evaluation to your computer. It will automatically save as an Adobe PDF. Send an email through outlook, with the completed evaluation attached, to the ACCO/DACCO/Designated Contact.

For ACCO Use Only

Once the completed evaluation is approved and ready to send to MOCS, complete the "approved by" section below. Then click the "Validate and Lock" button below. Once locked, the form cannot be modified--if modification is necessary, a new document must be created (from scratch). Save the Adobe PDF to your computer. Navigate to the "Performance Evaluation Upload" page in FMS/3 VENDEX to upload the locked evaluation and send to MOCS.

Approved By

Name: John Natoli

Title: CHIEF ENGINEER

Date: 02/09/2011

This form was locked on Fri Feb 11 2011 15:37:54 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time)